

December 2002

Dear Citizens of Detroit:

This is the 2002 Report of the Citizen Budget Program, under which the Budget Department administers the Annual Public Budget Meetings and Citizen Survey every Fall. This is the 6th year of the meetings and the 5th year of the survey. This year, for the first time, the Budget Department is providing a comprehensive followup report to the public.

900 citizens participated in the public meetings, the survey, or the youth meetings held at Detroit high schools. We are grateful to these individuals, and to the Planning and Research staff from the Henry Ford Health System who made it possible for us to poll public opinion electronically at the meetings. As always, we also benefited from community partners – the Motor City Resource Center and Howe Elementary School this year – who opened their doors to our meetings.

The Public Budget meetings and survey are the unofficial beginning of the budget development for the 2003-04 fiscal year budget. The meetings provide insight into what citizens want most and how the major tax supported city departments are performing. These findings are in the hands of all city departments as they develop proposals for the coming budget, and in the hands of Mayor Kilpatrick and the Detroit City Council.

Please visit our website for this report or other budget documents at www.ci.detroit.mi.us (Budget Department page). Perhaps you saw the Public Budget meetings televised on Government Access Channel 10. Please look for the meetings and survey every October. We need a continuing dialogue in our ongoing effort to provide better city services.

Sincerely,

Roger Short,
Budget Director

THE CITIZEN BUDGET PROGRAM: The City of Detroit Annual Public Budget Meetings and Citizen Survey



Table of Contents

What the Citizen Budget Program Does	2
The Meetings, Survey and Packets	3
What Citizens Told Us: The Findings	5
➤ Who participated?	6
➤ What are the most important responsibilities of City government?	7
Overall Purposes or Categories of City services ..	8
Mayor Kilpatrick's Policy Priorities ..	9
➤ What major department services are most important to citizens?	11
The Fire Department ..	11
The Police Department ..	12
The Public Lighting Department ..	13
The Department of Public Works ..	14
The Health Department ..	16
The Recreation Department ..	17
➤ How would citizens spend limited City tax money?	18
How The City Will Use The Findings	21
Appendix: Citizen Budget Program Management, Methods, and Detailed Survey Data	23

THE CITIZEN BUDGET PROGRAM: The City of Detroit Annual Public Budget Meetings and Citizen Survey



The Annual Public Budget Meetings requirement was added to the Detroit City Charter in 1996. The spirit of this requirement is increased communication with the public about scarce City resources.

We take this requirement seriously, so we created the Citizen Budget Program. The Budget Department organizes the meetings in different areas throughout Detroit every October, and puts out a companion *Survey of Citizen City Service Priorities* from September 1 – November 1 to look at major City government programs.

We hold one public meeting on the eastside and one on the westside with different community partners as hosts. We go to Detroit high school government classes. We distribute the Survey with return postage prepaid to 3800 community organizations and block clubs and through city facilities, and we post it on the city's website. And we encourage everyone to complete it.



Detroit Public Schools Executive Kenneth Burnley with Carolyn McKissic, Principal of the new Howe Elementary School which hosted the eastside public budget meeting. Photo: Kwabema Shabu

WHAT THE CITIZEN BUDGET PROGRAM DOES

The Citizen Budget Program aims for a dialogue with the community: framing the issues around the most important city services so that citizens can weigh in and be heard. For all the tough budget decisions we face, we want to be consistent with those sentiments the public has rallied around. The program started in 1997, so it's still growing.

Educational Goal

It's not always easy to figure out who does what in City government, and how decisions are made. We want to publicize major city services and the process for making budget decisions about them. The meetings and informational materials identify the services provided by the 6 largest tax-supported departments. An Informational Packet provides contact numbers, and the City's timeline for making budget decisions, so that the public can get involved. The Detroit Cable Commission films the meetings to air on Government Access Channel 10 in December.

Your Input

We try to get a variety of citizens from all parts of Detroit to participate. We reach out through community organizations, through libraries, recreation centers and other city facilities, and through the newspapers and radio. Budget Department staff go to Detroit schools to hear from High School students. Everyone can be heard whether or not they

come to the meetings, by completing the Citizen Survey between September 1 and November 1 every year and sending it to the City of Detroit Budget Department.



A citizen reviews the Informational Packet and Citizen Survey before giving his input electronically at the westside meeting held at the Motor City Resource Center, headquarters of Blight Busters, Inc.
Photo: Cordell Stubbs

THE MEETINGS, SURVEY AND PACKETS

The purpose of the Citizen Budget Program is focused on three areas: what are the most important responsibilities of City government? Half of all tax money is spent on the Fire, Health, Police, Public Lighting, Public Works and Recreation Departments; which of their services or programs should get the most attention? Should they get more attention at the expense of other activities funded by the City in 26 other agencies?

Feedback on these three key questions was collected at the evening meetings, through the internet, through the U.S. mail, and in high schools. This feedback was sorted according to the basic demographics collected from each participant, and interpreted according to how it was collected, in order to understand differences in citizen opinions.

The meetings followed the survey format: Directors or Deputy Directors of each major Department talked about their responsibilities. The Budget Director talked about the city's budget. After the presentations, we heard from dozens of citizens about their neighborhoods, their hopes for Detroit, and their expectations of the City.



With the assistance of the Henry Ford Health System, those at the 2002 meetings could give immediate feedback to each presenter, using handheld voting devices. This way, everyone's opinions were recorded. At the westside meeting, less than half used the devices. At the eastside meeting, more people used them but the meeting took 20 minutes longer. We asked 72 questions, as on the print survey; next year, we will reduce that number at the meetings so they are completed within 2 hours.

The Henry Ford Health System loaned their electronic voting system and staff, Peter Tate and Lisa Webb, to coordinate the surveying without charge. In the foreground, a citizen records his preference on the keypad according to the choices displayed on the screen. Photo: Cordell Stubbs

26-page Information Packets were distributed at the meetings, mailed out on request, and available on the city's website, along with the survey. These packets detailed city services and the annual budget in support of the same questions asked at the meeting and on the surveys.



Department representatives, pictured at Howe (left to right): Judith West, Interim Deputy Health Director; Rodney Stokes, Interim Recreation Director; Brenda Goss-Andrews, Deputy Chief of Police; Ulysses Burdell, Interim Deputy DPW Director; Tyrone Scott, Fire Commissioner; Mark Petty, PLD Director. Roger Short, Budget Director (not pictured), facilitated the meetings. Photo: Kwabema Shabu

"You represent all the people of Detroit. We deserve service from the least of us to the greatest of us. Put the People first..."
citizen in 48207 area

Thank you to the 900 citizens who participated this year

210 at the Meetings (108 through surveys)

194 through the Survey Mailer

199 through the City's Website

303 High School Students and their Teachers

Central (28)	Mackenzie (16)
Henry Ford (23)	Osborne (148)
Kettering (16)	St. Martin de Porres (72)

WHAT CITIZENS TOLD US: THE FINDINGS

A wide range of Detroiters gave input under the 2002 Citizen Budget program. With 500 citizen surveys and 300 student surveys completed, we heard from people of all ages and incomes, from all areas of Detroit. The meetings and survey alike gave citizens a set of structured questions, as well as an opportunity to comment about any subject. [Data is detailed by age and selected other factors starting on page 23.]

We asked questions that we consider every year in the budget development process:

- **What are the most important functions of City Government?**

The City takes responsibility for a wide range of functions that affect us all every day. Some of these are clearly more important to citizens than others. The Mayor's initial "Kids, Cops, Clean" priorities fall squarely within everyone's biggest concerns. Citizens want the City to revisit its current list of responsibilities, and focus resources better around public safety, health and educational activities.

- **What services are most important to you?**

The six major departments highlighted in this process receive half of all tax money. When citizens looked at all of these departments' responsibilities, clear priorities emerged among them, and only a few programs are seen as expendable.

The highest incomes were more dissatisfied with Recreation services, and placed more emphasis on clean-related policies. Except for Recreation, few factors other than age affected citizen opinion. Youth diverge from adults on services closest to what they see on the streets they walk.

- **How would you spend limited City tax money?**

Citizens would focus more of the city's limited resources on these six major departments – but not necessarily or equally on each. Citizens want to believe that maximum efficiencies are realized. For example, despite highest support for the public safety function, citizens were willing to cut the Police budget. Despite "clean city" support, citizens cut the Public Works budget.

The sentiment that maybe we should do less and might reduce the number of departments was especially high among seniors.

Citizens said that the City has to change the way it does business, to reorganize and take different approaches to service delivery. We learned that there are a number of major city services that people do not understand, and that we need to better communicate what we do. Likewise, citizens want the opportunity for input.

Who participated?

While the meetings drew primarily from the surrounding areas, residents in all areas but southwest Detroit attended. Our youth meetings were at schools throughout the City, and people from each of the city's 29 zip codes completed surveys through the mail or the City of Detroit website.

More website users reported high incomes than did meeting participants. Mail and web respondents were also more often home owners than were meeting respondents.

Who Participated: "Demographics" section	At the Meetings (108)	By Mail or the Website (393)	All (501; *804 w/ students)	2000 City
HOUSEHOLDS:				
% under \$25,000 annual income	30%	14%	17%	44%
% \$25,000-\$49,999	39%	37%	38%	28%
% over \$50,000	31%	49%	46%	28%
% home ownership	69%	80%	78%	55%
INDIVIDUALS:				
% "not presently employed"	14%	4%	6%	9%
Average household size	2.5	2.6	3.5 *	2.8
% under 18 years	0%	1%	40% *	31%
% between 18-24 years	0%	5%	5% *	10%
% between 25-54 years	54%	63%	36% *	42%
% over 54 years	46%	32%	20% *	18%

* includes 303 students

note: as much as 40% of meeting attendees didn't report on a given item

30% of City households consist of people living alone. In this survey, we heard from a similar mix of one-person households and families. One-third of our respondents are lifelong Detroiters, but we also heard from new residents. We do not know how many Detroiters belong to the thousands of block clubs and community organizations here, but 3 out of 5 of our respondents – adults and students alike – said they were members.

The survey and meeting had three budget sections and an open comment section. More than half – over 200 of the citizen surveys, and 164 of 303 student surveys – made comments to us about their neighborhoods.

Our 303 students, on average, had a grade point average of 3.2 or 'B'

What are the most important responsibilities of City government?

There are 9 overall purposes, or functions, of City government activities. Every program currently in the City's budget falls into one of these categories. Not all are completely funded by tax money. What should be the City's responsibility? Of City responsibilities, what should the City emphasize?



Citizens at the Howe Elementary meeting are asked their priorities among the functions and major services that are currently the City of Detroit's responsibility. Photo: Kwabema Shabu.

Many people commented that we should give up some current responsibilities in favor of Wayne County or other independent authorities: public lighting, some health programs, activities outside of city limits. Many comments related to selling off assets, including valuable real estate outside of the city or with development potential. A few suggested that we try to add revenues, such as grants or improved collections for services. There were also suggestions that we reduce the tax burden.

Overall Purposes or Categories of City Services

Citizens ranked the importance of each of these service categories, from 1 – 9. When the same ranking was given to two or more categories, we counted it differently than if not. For examples, two categories each given a #1 rank split the first and second place rank, and were a 1.5. This is called “weighting” and it gave us a truer idea of what purposes are truly most or least important to people.

We calculated the average rankings given each of the categories by adults and youth, and identified their most important priorities below. Adults under 62, seniors, and youth agreed on the top 3 priorities, but had some other differences also detailed below.

Priority Order of the City's Service Categories		
Adult	Youth	Overall
Public Safety	Public Safety	Public Safety
Educational Development	Public Health	Educational Development
Public Health	Educational Development	Public Health
Physical Environment	Mass Transportation	Mass Transportation
Economic Capacity	Physical Environment	Physical Environment
Mass Transportation	Building Supply/Condition	Economic Capacity
Recreation/Culture	Recreation/Culture	Recreation/Culture
Management	Economic Capacity	Building Supply/Condition
Building Supply/Condition	Management	Management

Note: statistical detail of adults and youth appears on p.25

1. *Public Safety (Police, Fire, EMS)*. Roughly two out of five people said it was the City's first responsibility, and three out of four said it was one of the City's three top priorities.
2. *Educational Development (libraries, Cable Channel 10, public relations; not public schools)*. One in five youth gave it highest priority. Average rankings were second highest for adults under 62, and third highest for youth and seniors.
3. *Public Health (Health centers and programs)*. Two out of five adults and three out of five youth said this was one of the three top priorities. Average rankings were third highest for adults under 62, and second highest for youth and seniors.
4. *Mass Transportation (bus services, street maintenance, City Airport, parking structures)*. People either strongly supported City responsibility for it, although with few first place votes, or did not. One in eight adults and one in five youth ranked it last, perhaps considering it some other government's responsibility.

5. *Physical Environment (solid waste, streetlights, landscaping, water/sewerage)*. For adults and youth alike, more first place and fewer last place votes than Economic Capacity, though a slightly higher average ranking.
6. *Economic Capacity (convention center, development assistance, job training)*. For adults, the average ranking is better than for Physical Environment or Transportation.
7. *Recreation and Culture (parks, recreation, cultural institutions)*. Citizen comments reflect the priority placed on parks, but this category as a whole received the second and third highest totals of last place votes from adults and youth.
8. *Building Supply/Conditions (building code enforcement, redevelopment, public housing)*. Among adults, second in last place votes, last in first place votes and the worst average ranking given. Youth had the sixth best average ranking.
9. *Management (financial, legal, human resources, City Council, Mayor, other line items)*. Nearly one in ten adults thought this was the most important category, but most other adults and youth ranked it very low or last.

Mayor Kilpatrick's Policy Priorities

Mayor Kilpatrick introduced “Kids, Cops and Clean” as his initial policy priorities, in order to focus city resources. We asked citizens to rank what of these is most important to them, using ‘1’ ‘2’ or ‘3’. Participants as a whole told us that all three of these priorities are of equal importance.



Average Rankings Given Each Priority '1' is highest, '3' is lowest			
	Adults	Youth	Overall
“Kids” programs	2.1	1.9	2.0
Improved Police	1.9	2.1	2.0
“Clean” City	2.0	2.0	2.0

Note: Rankings were weighted according to any ties given (ex: two #1 items are each ranked as 1.5)

Statistical detail by age and survey source appears on p.26, in the Appendix.

Looking at different respondents, there are some interesting differences in support for the three priorities. Among adults as a whole, “improved police” was slightly more likely to have the highest support. Programs for kids were most often the lowest priority. Seniors’ opinions were squarely within these priorities. Among youth, it was the opposite. Youth placed the highest priority on programs for kids and lowest priority on improved police service.

Percent of Unqualified Highest or Lowest Rankings Given Each Priority						
	Highest priority (adults)	Highest priority (youth)	Lowest Priority (adults)	Lowest Priority (youth)	Highest Priority (Overall)	Lowest Priority (Overall)
"Kids" programs	26%	36%	35%	26%	30%	31%
Improved Police	33%	25%	26%	39%	30%	31%
"Clean" City	27%	32%	31%	32%	29%	31%

Notes: "Highest" or "lowest" rankings are those rankings not qualified by ties; ex: the respondent gave only one item a #1, not two or all three. This weighting system explains why the columns don't total 100%.

Single person households were most likely to support improved policing. They were least likely to support kids programs.

Those reporting annual income above \$75,000 were more likely to value cleaning the city, and to place the lowest priority on kids programs. Similarly, new Detroit residents (less than 5 years) were most likely to support the clean city priority.

"They should take the abandoned cars off the street, fix up the playground, and put up lights so kids wouldn't be scared to walk home at night. And clean up the alleys."

Mackenzie High School student

More than half of all students made comments on their surveys, and nearly all of these comments raised issues related to cleaning up their neighborhoods, securing their walk routes, or providing more activities for them or fixing up recreational places.

"Hopefully, the city of detroit led by the Mayor's office is attempting to reorganize the city departments and focus on the highest priority services. At the same time, ... We need to get greater density in the city so that the existing service infrastructure cost can be shared by a greater number of people."

Citizen in 48214 area

There were many citizens who told us to reorganize our priorities. This included focusing City resources on visible field services that are fundamental to quality of life, or organizing city service delivery around the different needs of different neighborhoods (ex: locating service facilities closer to their neighborhoods). There were a number of urbanist comments: better preservation of important buildings; more pedestrianism; better bus service; environmentalism.

"Nowhere in this budget scheme is there an agency or category for neighborhoods. If neighborhoods are a priority, city government and budget need to be organized to address neighborhood issues."

Citizen in 48202 area

What major department services are most important to citizens?

We asked citizens to do two things for each of the 6 major Departments:

1. Tell us how SATISFIED they are in their neighborhoods with the services they know, using a 1 – 5 rank. A ‘1’ rank was “very satisfied” and a ‘5’ rank was “unacceptable.” Or, citizens were invited to indicate “don’t know” by any given item.
2. On the survey, create “YOUR Budget” for the coming year by dividing \$10 among the programs of each major department; at the meetings, identify the “most important” and “least important” of each major Department’s programs.

Youth tended to give higher satisfaction ratings than adults. This could reflect either their lack of expectations, or a more direct experience of some services than adults have. Adult ratings did not vary much according to age or income.

Most service ratings tended toward the middle (3.0), which reflects wide differences of opinions held about it. A rating farther from the 3.0 reflects clearer public opinion.

Many citizens commented that the City needs to get more out of what it spends. Suggestions include: decreasing higher level worker salaries; performance systems to increase worker accountability; customer training to increase responsiveness to the community; better risk management to reduce lawsuit payouts.

“Nothing to departments until they say what they have done, not what they are going to do”
Citizen in 48214 area

Citizen comments also emphasized focusing limited resources on the visible field services that are fundamental to quality of life in the city.

“If you concentrate on neighborhoods, police/fire, garbage pickup/cleaning up litter/enforcing all city ordinances and laws, very quickly quality of life would improve.”

Citizen in 48224 area

Improving the efficiency of our processes and increasing our partnerships with the community are two examples. One in ten comments were about these management methods, and one in four of the people who gave comments touched on these.

The Fire Department

Adults and youth alike were relatively satisfied with the mix of services offered by the Fire Department. Likewise, with the performance of these services.

Youth were equally satisfied with all services, while adults were most satisfied with firefighting.

Those reporting the highest income category (\$75,000+) were less satisfied with fire prevention services than were those reporting less than \$50,000 annual income. Otherwise, income was not a factor in citizen satisfaction with Fire services.

Many people don't know about arson investigation or the emergency preparedness function of responding to environmental disasters. Only two people expressed concern about the city's capacity for emergency environmental response. Yet, few people gave \$0 to any of these services. Few citizens commented about Fire Department services.

<u>Citizen Satisfaction and Budgets for Fire Department services:</u>					
Ranking (1 – 5)			“Your Budget”		
Adults	Youth		Adults	Youth	
2.6	2.5	Firefighters and equipment	\$2.76	\$1.94	
3.0	2.6	EMS emergency medical service	\$2.56	\$2.41	
2.9	2.3	Fire prevention	\$1.66	\$1.82	
3.0	2.6	Response to envir. disasters	\$1.54	\$1.67	
3.1	2.7	Arson Investigation	\$1.50	\$1.69	
			\$10	\$10	
('1' very satisfied, to					
'5' unacceptable)			Avg budgets may not add exactly to \$10		

Youth and seniors place the highest priority on emergency medical services. They gave the highest budget allocation to it, and the fewest number gave them \$0. Seniors were more likely to support fire prevention than other groups. Adults under 62 placed a higher priority on fire suppression in their budgets.

The Police Department

The most important responsibility of Police, by all accounts, is its visible presence in our communities. Citizens want to see them, to communicate what they see to them, and to have them respond to their requests. In neighborhoods, citizens were not satisfied with the precinct response time, crime prevention, or narcotics enforcement services (all rated at 3.7 or above). Income and age did not affect this dissatisfaction.

Seniors were less strongly supportive of precinct response time in their budgets than were adults under 62. Instead, seniors were more supportive of partnerships with the community.

As with City codes in general, citizens want stricter enforcement of laws. And stronger communication with youth congregating in the streets and parks. Police Officer conduct was an important issue to a number of people.

In this mix of services, one in seven would give up victim assistance programs and traffic enforcement. Seniors were the most supportive of traffic enforcement.

<u>Citizen Satisfaction and Budgets for Police Department services:</u>				
Ranking (1 – 5)			“Your Budget”	
Adults	Youth		Adults	Youth
3.8	3.2	Precinct response to calls	\$2.47	\$2.00
3.8	3.2	Crime prevention	\$1.85	\$1.99
3.7	2.9	Narcotics enforcement	\$1.87	\$1.83
3.3	3.1	Partnerships with the community	\$1.43	\$1.35
3.7	3.0	Victim assistance	\$1.27	\$1.53
3.4	2.8	Traffic enforcement	\$1.17	\$1.35
			\$10	\$10
<i>(‘1’ very satisfied, to ‘5’ unacceptable)</i>			<i>Avg budgets may not add exactly to \$10</i>	

Youth are very concerned about increasing the Police presence. One in six who made comments mentioned it – more than twice as many as cited the precinct response time. Along with dumpsite and playground maintenance services, precinct response services received the worst satisfaction ratings from youth. Drug enforcement was the next most commonly cited of public safety concerns, particularly in relation to shutting down “crack houses”.

The Public Lighting Department

Street lighting is far and away the most important to citizens of PLD’s programs. Adults told us in their satisfaction ratings and survey comments that they were not satisfied with the reliability of street lighting in their neighborhoods. Youth were less critical in their assessments.

Many said that they don’t understand PLD’s power production and steam and electricity distribution operations. Some people commented that these were businesses the City should probably get out of. One in six did not fund steam and electricity in their budgets, and one in seven did not fund electric power production.

Nearly one in five youth commented about street lighting, and how important it is to their sense of safety. Likewise, seniors’ budgets for street lighting were the highest of any

groups. Seniors were the least supportive of steam or electricity generation of any groups.

<u>Citizen Satisfaction and Budgets for Public Lighting Department services:</u>					
Ranking (1 – 5)			“Your Budget”		
Adults	Youth		Adults	Youth	
3.7	3.0	Street lighting	\$5.55	\$3.95	
3.0	2.7	Electric power production	\$2.52	\$2.88	
3.0	2.7	Steam or electricity for some buildings	<u>\$1.96</u>	<u>\$2.65</u>	
('1' very satisfied, to '5' unacceptable)			\$10	\$10	
Avg budgets may not add exactly to \$10					

The Department of Public Works

Garbage pickup has to be considered a success story for the City. Some citizens commented about spillage during the pickup, but appreciated the timeliness and reliability of the service. This was true in all zip codes areas of the city and across all income categories, and in the youth satisfaction ratings as well. Few city services rated as highly (see p. 30-31).

<u>Citizen Satisfaction and Budgets for Public Works services:</u>					
Ranking (1 – 5)			“Your Budget”		
Adults	Youth		Adults	Youth	
2.4	2.4	Garbage pickup / waste disposal	\$2.17	\$1.77	
4.0	3.3	Dumping and vacant lot cleanup	\$2.14	\$1.73	
3.8	3.1	Maintenance of City-owned streets	\$1.76	\$1.38	
3.4	3.0	Snow and ice removal	\$1.62	\$1.88	
3.2	3.1	Street cleaning	\$1.31	\$1.48	
3.2	2.8	Streets and traffic systems design	<u>\$1.02</u>	<u>\$1.19</u>	
('1' very satisfied, to '5' unacceptable)			\$10	\$10	
Avg budgets may not add exactly to \$10					

Bulk pickup is another matter. Citizens told us they wanted those who set out bulk items at incorrect times to be punished. A few people suggested more frequent pickup times.

We are all concerned about vacant land in the City. So many city services are connected to this problem. The majority told us that current dumpsite and vacant lot cleanup services were unacceptable. This item received the poorest satisfaction rating

of any item from youth (3.26) as well as adults (4.04). Many people commented that alternative approaches to this problem were in order. Likewise, they asked for more aggressive demolition in the neighborhoods. Youth were especially concerned about the blight and the danger of all of these vacant buildings. Budgets reflected this.

There were a lot of comments about enforcement of property maintenance standards, which is a responsibility of the Buildings and Safety Engineering Department. Now that the City owns so many of these lots, citizens asked that the City do a better job of caring for these lots and transferring them to productive use, such as through community purchase of property. This is a responsibility of the Real Estate Section of the Planning and Development Department.

Another area of concern is the condition of roads. One in ten people said they don't know about the street design service. While many people may not know which roads are the city's responsibility to maintain, and which are the County's, citizens in every zip code area of Detroit told us that there needs to be more maintenance. Further, street signage is an area of concern. Seniors were the most supportive of street maintenance.

"I think that it would be helpful and better for the Mayor, etc., to build houses where they were torn down to make our city and community do a whole 360°. And I think that would make people respect the City more and live in a better environment."

Osborn High School student

Of all youth concerns, the most common related to the physical environment of their neighborhoods: unkempt and abandoned buildings, vacant land, litter in the streets, the lack of facilities. Nearly one in three of the youth who made comments asked that the streets be cleaned up of dumped debris, abandoned cars, or of blowing litter. Nearly one in four of these youth made comments that urged more aggressive demolition. Most of these comments tied demolition (now a Buildings and Safety Engineering Department responsibility) to an overall program of building renovation and redevelopment of vacant land.

Youth are also very sensitive to issues that might be called pedestrian-oriented, such as timeliness of snow and ice removal (their highest budget item, with the fewest \$0 allocations), sidewalk repair, weed overgrowth on vacant lots, and the condition of roads. Students throughout the city mentioned Road maintenance. This contrasts with just four comments relating to availability of buses.

The Health Department

Health administers a variety of programs, and those who said they understood this mix were somewhat satisfied with it. Performance of most services, other than rodent control (transferred to Health this year) and substance abuse treatment, rated adequately. The majority of people were very satisfied with the birth and death certificates operation. Youth told us they were satisfied with pregnant women services, communicable disease prevention, and restaurant inspection services as well.

Many people told us that they don't know about Health's services, other than animal control and rodent control. This may be, at least in part, because so many are targeted services. A number commented that Health should do more public information in the form of Health Fairs. Nearly half of citizens did not know about primary care or pregnant women and children services.

At the meetings and in the survey, citizens told us that the most important Health Department responsibility is communicable disease prevention, investigation and immunizations. Substance abuse prevention and treatment received equal attention in the budgets created for Health. This is true for seniors and for adults under 62.

<u>Citizen Satisfaction and Budgets for Health Department services:</u>				
Ranking (1 – 5)			“Your Budget”	
Adults	Youth		Adults	Youth
3.1	2.6	Communicable disease prevention, investigation; immunizations	\$1.48	\$1.19
3.4	2.9	Substance abuse prevention, treatment	\$1.49	\$1.21
2.8	2.6	Pregnant women and children services	\$1.40	\$1.23
3.7	3.2	Enforcing rules re: rodents	\$1.25	\$1.06
3.2	2.5	Primary care clinics, dental services	\$1.23	\$.97
3.3	3.1	Animal control	\$1.20	\$1.44
3.1	2.6	Restaurant inspections, related licenses	\$1.15	\$1.01
2.4	2.2	Birth records and Death certificates	\$.84	\$1.18
			\$10	\$10
('1' very satisfied, to '5' unacceptable)			Avg budgets may not add exactly to \$10	

Youth were more likely to comment about what might be called human services – the need for homeless services and jobs programs – than about public health programs. There were a few comments about control of stray dogs, and a few comments for free access to primary care services.

Seniors were less supportive of restaurant inspections and licensing, and birth and death records, than were adults under 62 and youth.

The Recreation Department

Especially for recreation department services, youth had very different opinions than adults. Youth satisfaction for all recreation services was much greater than adult satisfaction ratings for recreation.

This was the one department in which those in the highest income category had very different opinions from those in the lowest category. Those earning \$75,000 + annual income were much more likely to be dissatisfied with Belle Isle, Riverfront parks and playground maintenance, with recreation programs, and with athletic competition services.

After school programs were close to the highest priority of survey respondents taken as a whole. Some citizens made a point to distinguish between after school programs and other recreation programs offered. Youth placed after school programs above other recreation department programs in their budgets.

<u>Citizen Satisfaction and Budgets for Recreation Department services:</u>				
Ranking (1 – 5)			“Your Budget”	
Adults	Youth		Adults	Youth
3.6	3.1	Belle Isle, Riverfront parks	\$1.87	\$1.64
3.5	2.5	After-school programs	\$1.70	\$2.80
3.4	2.6	Recreation programs	\$1.40	\$1.43
4.0	3.3	Playground maintenance, activities	\$1.33	\$1.21
3.8	2.9	Landscape of parks and trees	\$1.33	\$1.04
3.9	2.8	Recreation center/equipment mtc	\$1.33	\$1.21
3.2	2.3	Athletic leagues/competitions	\$.89	\$1.15
			\$10	\$10
<i>(“1” very satisfied, to “5” unacceptable)</i>			<i>Avg budgets may not add exactly to \$10</i>	

Belle Isle and Riverfront parks received the highest budgets from adults, but were a distant second for youth. This was due in large part to high levels of support from seniors. Seniors were less supportive of after-school and other recreation programs than other groups.

One in four of the adults who completed surveys, and half of those at the meetings, told us not to fund athletic leagues and competition. Even one in five youth said the same. More than one-third of respondents did not know that service.

Landscaping of parks and trees was the subject of many of your concerns. This contrasted with youth, who gave it the lowest budget allocation. Nearly one in three youth gave it no funding. The need for better park and neighborhood tree maintenance was one of the most frequent survey comments of adults, and received one of the lowest satisfaction ratings. Playground and recreation center maintenance received similarly poor ratings: all close to 4 on the scale of 1 – 5.

“Make more programs and activities for teens to do on the weekend besides movies and bowling. Make facilities available in Detroit so we can stay in the City instead of always going far out.”

St. Martin de Porres
High School student

One in four of the youth that made comments wanted either recreation programs geared toward them, or serviceable playground or recreation center facilities in their neighborhoods. They were more likely to ask for facilities than the programs.

How would citizens spend limited City tax money?

We asked “How much money would you give to each department?” We wanted to know how the current budget for each major department, for the 7 staff agencies, and for 26 other tax-supported agencies, might be changed. Which programs should get more attention, and at the expense of which other programs funded by City tax money?

Only three out of five citizens – adults and youth alike – gave us feedback on this question. This undoubtedly reflects the length of the overall survey as well as how challenging the question is.

Two out of three increased the share of current budget spent on the six major departments. Consistent with citizen comments about reducing the scope of city government, this was typically at the expense of the amount spent on the city’s many other tax-supported agencies. Adult’s budgets tended to keep whole the share devoted to internal staff departments.

“I moved into the city a year ago from upstate, and am delighted to be part of the renaissance of Detroit – but there’s no question the city has a long way to go in providing basic services for its citizens. The city HAS to consider privatizing services, because it simply is unable to deliver them on such tight budgets (and I say this as a union-supporting Democrat!).”

Citizen in 48201 “Midtown” area

Seniors (62 and over) had the biggest emphasis on the basics in their budgets. They gave the largest budgets to the 6 major departments and were the most likely to cut the budgets for internal staff departments. Their increases went primarily to Recreation, and to Public Lighting and Health. Seniors were like adults under 62 in cutting the Police Department total budget. Fire Department and Recreation Department budgets were most likely to be increased.

Those reporting over \$75,000 annual income were more likely to increase Recreation budget. Unlike those below \$50,000 annual income, they did not typically cut the Police budget. Those in the lower income groups cut Police, and increased Fire, Public Lighting and Recreation allotments.

Two out of three adults as a whole increased the Recreation and Public Lighting Department Budgets, and well over half increased the Health Department budget. Half decreased the Public Works and the Police Department budgets.

Less than half of all youth increased the share spent on major departments – slightly less than increased the share spent on internal staff support. Nearly half of the youth budgets cut the other tax-supported share. This may reflect their lack of experience with the thought processes behind making budgets, as well as calculation errors.

**“Your budget” for Major Department services:
How citizens divide \$100 among major line items**

	Current	Adults	Youth	
Fire Department	\$10.49	\$11.79	\$12.36	
Police Department	24.53	23.56	18.50	<i>decrease</i>
Public Lighting Department	4.77	6.24	7.63	
Public Works Department	14.07	13.25	11.93	<i>decrease</i>
Recreation Department	4.09	7.39	8.31	
Health Department	6.66	7.39	9.56	
Major Departments	\$64.61	\$69.62	\$66.06	
Internal Staff Departments	\$9.94	\$9.42	\$12.45	
Other Tax-Supported Agencies	\$25.45	\$21.32	\$22.93	<i>decrease</i>
Totals	\$100	\$100	\$100	

Note: Some calculations don't add exactly to \$100, due to math errors or rounding

Detail by age and income appear on p. 31.

More than a dozen comments suggested contracting out services such as after school programs, cleanups, and technology and financial support functions. The same number asked for more meaningful partnerships with community organizations.

Youth had a similar sense about collaboration with the community, with more than a dozen suggesting that the City should help organize Neighborhood Watches or block clubs. These kinds of changes were clearly connected to cost savings.

Among the comments about reorganizing city services, some said to stop subsidies. One in ten who made comments said they had no complaints about city services in their neighborhoods. A few felt that we should be focusing on reducing the tax burden to increase growth in the City.

“Some things may not need to be government’s responsibility – cleanup, public transportation, public health, snow removal, etc. If privatizing, or partnership with corporations or nonprofits are used appropriately, waste in management can always be addressed.”

Citizen in 48216 area

“as a whole, services are as good as can be expected considering the many problems facing Detroit. Shrinking population, exodus of businesses resulting in smaller budget.”

Citizen in 48221 area

HOW THE CITY WILL USE THE FINDINGS

The Budget Department has provided this information to Mayor Kilpatrick, to City Council members, to every City Department Director, and to citizens who attended the public meetings. This report is also available on the City's website.

By December 8, all City agencies are required to make requests for next year's budget (which covers July 1, 2003 – June 30, 2004). The budget process includes a series of reviews of agency proposals, first by the Budget Director, then by the Mayor, then by the City Council. These reviews are based on the actual costs we see in the current year, and on the priorities of City leaders. With the Citizen Budget information, we can now more effectively factor citizen concerns and priorities into these important decisions.

Citizens, business, community organizations and everyone with a stake in Detroit, are encouraged to follow the issues and get involved when City Council opens debate in April and May before making final budget decisions.

*"Questionnaire makes me appreciate the tough decisions city officials have to make –"
citizen in 48214 area*



Those who come to the meetings provided their mailing address so the City could mail the Report and send them next year's announcement materials. Photo: Cordell Stubbs

APPENDIX: CITIZEN BUDGET PROGRAM MANAGEMENT, METHODS AND DETAILED SURVEY DATA

Managing the Citizen Budget Program

1997 City of Detroit Charter revisions require that a public meeting be held by November 1 each year to review programs, services and activities to be included in the next budget, and to receive public comment (Section 8-203). This applies only to: Fire, Health, Police, Public Lighting, Public Works, Recreation and Water and Sewerage (DWSD) Departments. DWSD holds separate public meetings.

Budget Department staff choose the sites, create the annual survey, do the community outreach, and arrange meeting logistics. 3 staff work approximately ½ time on these tasks for two months. The process starts in July – just as the current year budget takes effect. Janet Anderson, PhD, Budget Manager II, manages the program.

The print materials are produced with the assistance of Communications and Creative Service Department staff, who also work on media contacts. In 2002, the Budget Director and Deputy Budget Director filmed a Public Service Announcement for Government Access Channel 10, and did a few radio interviews.

Neighborhood City Halls staff helped with outreach. Councilperson Sheila Cockrel mailed 1500 surveys to precinct delegates and other local activists. Budget Department staff prepared a bulk mail to 3800 community organizations and block clubs in the Neighborhood City Halls and City Plan Commission databases. Budget staff also delivered surveys and announcements to every city facility and made presentations at city meetings such as the Police Precinct Community Relations meetings in the neighborhoods of the meeting sites. There are over 100 city facilities located in all parts of the city: libraries, recreation centers, health centers, human service centers, police precincts and several downtown office buildings.

Direct expenses for this effort were for mailing out the announcement and survey and the neighborhood postcard, for paper for the flyers and surveys, and for publication of a meeting notice in the Michigan Chronicle and in the Detroit Legal News (as required by the City Charter). Modest petty cash expenditures allow us to provide refreshments at the meetings. In 2002, we will also incur cost to mail out this public meeting report to all participants in the process.

The history of public meeting outreach and citizen participation is below, followed by detailed data from all three sections of the Citizen Survey referenced in the report narrative. The data is descriptive of the electronic voting information acquired at the meetings, the on-line surveys transmitted, and prepaid mailer surveys returned. Sub-groups were examined according to demographic information reported (reflected by the 'N' indicated), but no statistical tests of association were performed.

History of Public Meeting Outreach and Participation

	<i>Outreach</i>			<i>Participation</i>			
Meeting Site By Year	Mail Units	Flyers to City Sites & Events	Print Info Packets distributed	Number Attending Meetings	Meeting Surveys Received	Mailed in/ Internet Surveys	Youth Surveys Received
Northwest Activities Butzel Family Center				90 77	61 41		
1997 Totals	600	500	200	167	102	n.a.	n.a.
11th Police Precinct LASED Comm. Ctr				66 44			
1998 Totals	600	1600	200	110	95²	n.a.	141
9th Police Precinct 6th Police Precinct				55 31			
1999 Totals ¹	600	1500	537	86	65	n.a.	n.a.
Adams-Butzel Center Coleman Young Ctr				71 26			
2000 Totals	3424	5000	316	97	46	106	n.a.
Dominican High Williams Center				47 37	35 28		
2001 Totals	3517	4150	170	84	63	218	159
Blight Busters' Center				111	38		
Howe Elementary				99	70		
2002 Totals¹	3824/7553	11,350	215	210	108	393	
Note 1: Starting in 1999, an announcement booklet and flyers were distributed; in 2002, a post card went to each site's Zip+4 Note 2: In 1998, youth participated at the 11 th Precinct meeting; starting in 2001, meetings were held in 6 schools							

58% of our survey participants were from the following nine zip codes:

48224 – 11%	48235 – 6.5%	48238 – 5.1%
48219 – 7.6%	48214 – 5.7%	48207 – 4.8%
48221 – 6.5%	48234 – 5.7%	48223 – 4.8%

Survey Section I – Explanation of Rankings of Public Functions, and further detail of rankings of Mayor's Policy Priorities

On the survey, the service categories did not include any detail about the budgetary items each contained. Citizens were ranking them according to what they thought each

represented. At the meetings, the Budget Director made a brief presentation of the section that was slightly more elaborate of the categories.

A citizen's ranking might reflect their opinion of the importance of the service, or it might reflect what they think the City of Detroit's role is in providing that service. For example, some citizens ranked Public Transportation low because they felt that the City of Detroit should not be the provider; undoubtedly, this could have been part of public health, educational development or other rankings as well.

Rankings were weighted to take into account "overvoting" or the casting of multiple 1st place votes. Approximately 10% of the surveys involved some of this, in any of the positions. People may have felt they were giving emphasis to items by placing them all as #1, but we chose to weight them in order to preserve the value of the #1. If 5 items were given a #1, then these items shared the first 5 places (or a '3' ranking each).

This same weighting technique was used for Kids, Cops, Clean rankings.

Details about the votes by service category:

- 1. Public Safety (Police, Fire, emergency services): #1 for adults and youth.** 41% of adults and 35% of youth gave it first place and three out of four said it was one of three top priorities for the City. Average rankings of 2.4 (adults) and 2.7 (youth).
- 2. Educational Development (libraries, Cable Channel 10, public relations): #2 for adults and #3 for youth.** 8% of adults and 20% of youth gave it first place votes. Average rankings of 4.2 (adults under 62), 3.8 (seniors) and 3.5 (youth).
- 3. Public Health (Health centers and programs): #3 for adults, #2 for youth.** 6% of adults and 13% of youth gave it first place. Two out of five adults said this was one of the top 3. Average rankings of 4.8 (adults under 62), 3.2 (seniors) and 3.3 (youth).
- 4. Mass Transportation (bus services, street maintenance, City Airport, parking structures): #6 for adults, #4 for youth.** Close to Economic Capacity and Physical Environment in average rankings of (5.1 for adults and youth), but far fewer first place votes received. One in eight adults and one in five youth ranked it last on the list of what the City should be doing.
- 5. Physical Environment (solid waste, streetlights, landscaping, water/sewerage): #4 for adults, #5 for youth.** For adults and youth alike, more first place votes and fewer last place votes than Economic Capacity, though a slightly higher average ranking (5.3). Roughly 3 in 10 place it in the Top 3.
- 6. Economic Capacity (convention center, development assistance, job training) #5 for adults, #8 for youth.** For adults, average ranking of 5.0 is better than for

Physical Environment or Mass Transportation, while for youth, the average ranking of 6.2 is worse. Only a few youth gave this the highest priority.

- 7. Recreation and Culture (parks, recreation, cultural institutions): #7 for adults, for youth.** While citizen comments reflect the importance placed on parks, this category as a whole received an average rank of 5.8 for adults and 6.0 for youth and the second or third highest total of last place votes.
- 8. Building Supply/Conditions (building code enforcement, neighborhood redevelopment, public housing): #9 for adults, #6 for youth.** Among adults, 2nd to Management in last place votes received, but last in first place votes received and the highest average ranking (6.7). Among youth, last in first place votes received, but fifth in last place votes, and the sixth highest average ranking (5.75).
- 9. Management (financial, legal, human resources, City Council, Mayor, other line items): #8 for adults, #9 for youth.** Nearly one in ten adults thought this was the most important category, but most other adults and youth ranked it very low if not last (average of 5.8 for adults under 62, 6.8 for seniors, and 6.9 for youth).

Details about the citizen votes by Kids, Cops, Clean policy priority:

Highest Priority Policies by Source of Survey

	Meeting Respondents	Mailer/Internet Respondents	Youth Respondents
"Kids" programs	36.71%	25.7%	35.8%
Improved Police	35.44%	33.1%	25.3%
"Clean" City	27.85%	27.2%	32.1%

Note: Meeting respondents rated "highest priority"; Mailer/Internet respondents rated '1' '2' or '3'

Lowest Priority Policies by Source of Survey

	Meeting Respondents	Mailer/Internet Respondents	Youth Respondents
"Kids" programs	32.50%	35.72%	25.7%
Improved Police	28.75%	24.87%	38.5%
"Clean" City	38.75%	29.37%	32.8%

Note: Meeting respondents rated "highest priority"; Mailer/Internet respondents rated '1' '2' or '3'

Average Rankings Given Each Priority by Sub-group

	Under 62 years old	62 years old and over	Less than 5 years in Detroit
"Kids" programs	2.07	2.03	2.28
Improved Police	1.87	1.97	1.84
"Clean" City	2.06	2.01	1.40

Under 62, N=243; 62 and over, N=61; Less than 5 years residents, N=31

Survey Section II – Further detail of budget allocations and satisfaction ratings given major city department programs

We asked citizens to tell us how satisfied they are in their neighborhoods with the services they know, using a 1 – 5 rank. A '1' rank was "very satisfied" and a '5' rank was "unacceptable." Or, citizens were invited to indicate "don't know" by any given item and these were excluded from average calculations.

A 1 – 5 rating scale depends heavily on criteria that are often subjective. For example, a rating of unacceptable might indicate a single bad experience, or it might reflect wide-ranging service level expectations. In sum, these rankings do not explain why a person is dissatisfied, they only raise flags.

We also asked citizens on the survey to create "YOUR Budget" for the coming year by dividing \$10 among the programs of each major department; at the meetings, we asked citizens to identify the "most important" and "least important" of each major Department's programs.

The budget allocations are assumed to reflect the order of priority placed on each service. If an item was given the highest amount, it was assumed to be the most important to that individual. It was not assumed that the individual felt it was currently under-resourced, or that the individual perceived that it was a more costly item to accomplish. An item given \$0 was assumed to be something the individual thought the department shouldn't do.

Using the data this way, we adjusted budgets for under- or over-allocation. For example, if a citizen balanced to \$8, each item was prorated up by 25% to equal to the \$10 total. In this way, the data was used as shares or percentages and not as dollars. Section III was intended to measure overall priorities placed on departments.

The Fire Department

Your budget for Fire Department services:

	Adults	Youth	Under 62	Seniors
Firefighters and equipment	\$2.76	\$1.94	\$2.83	\$2.25
EMS emergency medical service	\$2.56	\$2.41	\$2.57	\$2.58
Fire prevention	\$1.66	\$1.82	\$1.59	\$2.07
Response to envir. disasters	\$1.54	\$1.67	\$1.47	\$1.72
Arson Investigation	\$1.50	\$1.69	\$1.53	\$1.45
	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100
			N=193	N=46

Averages are based on citizen numbers and may not add to 100%

The Police Department

Your budget for Police Department services:

	Adults	Youth	Under 62	Seniors
Precinct response to calls	\$2.47	\$2.00	\$2.56	\$1.98
Crime prevention	\$1.85	\$1.99	\$1.89	\$1.82
Narcotics enforcement	\$1.87	\$1.83	\$1.84	\$1.74
Partnerships with the community	\$1.43	\$1.35	\$1.42	\$1.70
Victim assistance	\$1.27	\$1.53	\$1.17	\$1.30
Traffic enforcement	\$1.17	\$1.35	\$1.13	\$1.41
	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100
			N=201	N=47

Averages are based on citizen numbers and may not add to 100%

The Public Lighting Department

Your budget for Public Lighting Department services:

	Adults	Youth	Under 62	Seniors
Street lighting	\$5.55	\$3.95	\$5.36	\$6.08
Electric power production	\$2.52	\$2.88	\$2.64	\$2.37
Steam or electricity for some bldgs	\$1.96	\$2.65	\$2.01	\$1.64
	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100
			N=199	N=45

Averages are based on citizen numbers and may not add to 100%

The Department of Public Works

Your budget for Public Works services:

	Adults	Youth	Under 62	Seniors
Garbage pickup / waste disposal	\$2.17	\$1.77	\$2.18	\$2.22
Dumping and vacant lot cleanup	\$2.14	\$1.73	\$2.15	\$2.02
Maintenance of City-owned streets	\$1.76	\$1.38	\$1.69	\$1.93
Snow and ice removal	\$1.62	\$1.88	\$1.59	\$1.50
Street cleaning	\$1.31	\$1.48	\$1.31	\$1.48
Streets and traffic systems design	\$1.02	\$1.19	\$1.08	\$.88
	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100
			N=202	N=44

Averages are based on citizen numbers and may not add to 100%

The Health Department

Your budget for Health Department services:

	Adults	Youth	Under 62	Seniors
Communicable disease prevention, investigation; immunizations	\$1.48	\$1.19	\$1.40	\$1.54
Substance abuse prevention, treatment	\$1.49	\$1.21	\$1.51	\$1.57
Pregnant women and children services	\$1.40	\$1.23	\$1.36	\$1.42
Enforcing rules re: rodents	\$1.25	\$1.06	\$1.27	\$1.23
Primary care clinics, dental services	\$1.23	\$.97	\$1.25	\$1.35
Animal control	\$1.20	\$1.44	\$1.17	\$1.34
Restaurant inspections, related licenses	\$1.15	\$1.01	\$1.23	\$.89
Birth records and Death certificates	\$.84	\$1.18	\$.85	\$.71
	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100
			N=194	N=42

Averages are based on citizen numbers and may not add to 100%

The Recreation Department

Your budget for Recreation Department services:

	Adults	Youth	Under 62	Seniors
Belle Isle, Riverfront parks	\$1.87	\$1.64	\$1.72	\$2.18
After-school programs	\$1.70	\$2.80	\$1.68	\$1.54
Recreation programs	\$1.40	\$1.43	\$1.41	\$1.44
Playground maintenance, activities	\$1.33	\$1.21	\$1.50	\$1.58
Landscape of parks and trees	\$1.33	\$1.04	\$1.44	\$1.23
Recreation center/equipment mtc	\$1.33	\$1.21	\$1.36	\$1.26
Athletic leagues/competitions	\$.89	\$1.15	\$.88	\$.98
	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100
			N=194	N=46

Averages are based on citizen numbers and may not add to 100%

SATISFACTION RATINGS FOR MAJOR CITY SERVICES

All Adults and Youth

‘1’ (Very Satisfied) to ‘5’ (Unacceptable); ‘8’ is Don’t Know

DEPT	Service Description	2002 Avg Ratings			2002 % Don't Know		
		Adults	Youth	Overall	Adults	Youth	Overall
DPW	Garbage Pick-up	2.38	2.41	2.39	0.50	2.97	1.56
	Dump Site / Vacant-lot Cleanup	4.04	3.26	3.72	4.58	10.23	6.95
	Snow and Ice Removal	3.42	3.02	3.25	2.54	2.97	2.68
	Street Cleaning	3.21	3.08	3.16	0.76	3.63	1.98
	Streets and Traffic Design	3.15	2.80	2.99	10.43	9.24	9.90
	Street Maintenance	3.77	3.08	3.49	3.30	12.21	7.04
POLICE	Precinct Response to Calls	3.75	3.22	3.52	8.39	9.24	8.75
	Partnerships with Community	3.27	3.06	3.18	11.45	15.51	13.17
	Crime Prevention	3.75	3.20	3.15	11.70	10.23	11.07
	Victim Assistance	3.69	2.99	3.35	31.04	15.84	23.67
	Traffic Enforcement	3.37	2.78	3.11	7.12	8.25	7.60
	Narcotics Enforcement	3.70	2.91	3.37	17.55	14.19	16.05
PLD	Street Lighting	3.65	3.01	3.37	1.52	2.97	2.14
	Steam or Electricity Distribution	2.99	2.74	2.85	45.54	16.50	29.80
	Electricity Production	3.00	2.67	2.83	34.86	14.19	24.44
FIRE	Fire Suppression	2.64	2.48	2.56	23.15	15.51	19.64
	Fire Prevention	2.86	2.29	2.57	28.49	12.87	20.92
	Arson Investigation	3.08	2.70	2.88	39.69	22.11	30.91
	Emergency Medical Service	2.98	2.63	2.81	18.82	4.29	11.90
	Environmental Disaster Response	3.00	2.63	2.80	43.25	21.12	30.80
REC	Center, Equipment Maintenance	3.87	2.80	3.40	18.06	13.53	16.02
	Landscaping of Parks & Trees	3.82	2.93	3.45	6.10	11.55	8.39
	Belle Isle/Riverfront Parks	3.63	3.11	3.40	6.10	7.59	6.74
	Recreation Programs	3.44	2.63	3.06	19.33	10.23	15.12
	Athletic Leagues/Competition	3.20	2.28	2.72	31.29	7.26	19.03
	Playground Maintenance	3.97	3.25	3.65	8.14	6.27	7.31
	After School Programs	3.51	2.53	3.03	26.71	10.89	19.15
HEALTH	Animal Control	3.27	3.06	3.17	24.17	14.19	19.51
	Birth and Death Records	2.40	2.23	2.32	36.38	29.70	33.30
	Communicable Disease/Immun	3.14	2.60	2.89	33.58	24.09	29.13
	Restaurant Inspection/Licenses	3.08	2.55	2.82	36.38	21.78	29.27
	Pregnant Women & Children	2.82	2.61	2.70	46.05	20.46	32.43
	Enforcing Rules re: rodents	3.69	3.16	3.45	29.00	26.40	27.84
	Primary Medical & Dental Care	3.21	2.46	2.78	44.78	14.52	28.31
	Substance Abuse Services	3.41	2.89	3.06	40.71	18.81	29.46

“Adults” = web, mailed and meeting surveys [= 501; up to 10% missing on given items]

“Youth” = completed surveys: 6 high schools [= 303; up to 12% missing on given items]

SATISFACTION RATINGS FOR MAJOR CITY SERVICES

Comparisons Among Seniors and Income Groups

‘1’ (Very Satisfied) to ‘5’ (Unacceptable); ‘8’ is Don’t Know

DEPT	Service Description	Avg Ratings All Adults	Avg Ratings Seniors	Avg Ratings High Inc / Lower Inc
DPW	Garbage Pick-up	2.38	2.26	2.25 / 2.53
	Dump Site / Vacant-lot Cleanup	4.04	3.81	4.15 / 4.02
	Snow and Ice Removal	3.42	3.49	3.56 / 3.40
	Street Cleaning	3.21	na	3.15 / 3.27
	Streets and Traffic Design	3.15	3.26	3.21 / 3.20
	Street Maintenance	3.77	3.77	3.83 / 3.81
POLICE	Precinct Response to Calls	3.75	3.72	3.81 / 3.79
	Partnerships with Community	3.27	2.80	3.16 / 3.26
	Crime Prevention	3.75	3.51	3.80 / 3.86
	Victim Assistance	3.69	3.50	3.78 / 3.74
	Traffic Enforcement	3.37	na	3.15 / 3.44
	Narcotics Enforcement	3.70	3.64	3.67 / 3.74
PLD	Street Lighting	3.65	3.66	3.53 / 3.73
	Steam or Electricity Distribution	2.99	3.00	2.93 / 2.97
	Electricity Production	3.00	3.00	3.22 / 2.85
FIRE	Fire Suppression	2.64	2.75	2.67 / 2.54
	Fire Prevention	2.86	2.67	3.12 / 2.67
	Arson Investigation	3.08	2.70	3.03 / 2.95
	Emergency Medical Service	2.98	2.84	2.91 / 2.94
	Environmental Disaster Response	3.00	3.03	2.94 / 2.92
REC	Center, Equipment Maintenance	3.87	3.67	4.02 / 3.84
	Landscaping of Parks & Trees	3.82	3.75	3.97 / 3.80
	Belle Isle/Riverfront Parks	3.63	3.47	3.99 / 3.44
	Recreation Programs	3.44	3.39	3.71 / 3.28
	Athletic Leagues/Competition	3.20	3.23	3.44 / 3.17
	Playground Maintenance	3.97	3.80	4.21 / 3.93
	After School Programs	3.51	3.35	3.65 / 3.42
HEALTH	Animal Control	3.27	3.21	3.25 / 3.27
	Birth and Death Records	2.40	2.11	2.64 / 2.35
	Communicable Disease/Immun	3.14	3.07	3.34 / 3.02
	Restaurant Inspection/Licenses	3.08	2.89	3.22 / 3.04
	Pregnant Women & Children	2.82	2.81	2.82 / 2.83
	Enforcing Rules re: rodents	3.69	3.68	3.60 / 3.76
	Primary Medical & Dental Care	3.21	3.31	3.20 / 3.29
	Substance Abuse Services	3.41	3.43	3.51 / 3.41

“Adults” = web, mailed and meeting surveys [= 501; up to 10% missing on given items]

“Seniors” = over 61 [avg N=54]

“High Inc” = over \$75,000 annual [avg N=70]; “Lower Inc” = below \$50,000 annual [avg N=175]

Survey Section III – Further detail of citizen budgets for City tax money

This section asked citizens to consider all the services currently funded by general tax-supported dollars. Enterprise agencies, whose activities are funded by sales of services or grants, were not listed in this exercise. We wanted feedback about how we should spend resources that are most under the city's control.

Citizens were not provided information about the internal staff departments or the other service departments. This meant that they were mostly reacting to the total current budget shares of each category in the aggregate. They were only asked for the total allocations for the management and support and the other field service categories.

In addition to this information deficit, the calculations challenged a lot of people. Even focusing solely on the 6 major departments, the total internal staff department line, and the total field service line, there were calculation errors. These were weighted in the manner of the Section II departmental budgets, so that we could keep to a standard (100%) total, and control for our current resource climate.

The exercise did not measure whether people think the city should reduce its general fund expenditures so the tax rate could come down, or whether people wanted the city to find other new revenues or thought that the city's tax base would grow.

“Your budget” for Major Department services: How citizens of different ages divide \$100 among major line items

	Current \$	Age 61 +	Under 62	Hi Inc	Low Inc
Fire Department	\$10.49	\$10.93	\$11.45	\$11.07	\$12.41
Police Department	24.53	22.69	23.02	24.11	22.47
Public Lighting Department	4.77	6.42	6.38	5.48	6.16
Public Works Department	14.07	13.72	13.42	13.17	12.70
Recreation Department	4.09	10.26	7.00	10.91	6.39
Health Department	6.66	7.68	7.35	6.34	7.45
Major Departments	\$64.61	\$72.23	\$67.88	\$70.45	\$67.50
Internal Staff Departments	\$9.94	\$7.65	\$9.82	\$9.02	\$9.20
Other Tax-Supported Agencies	\$25.45	\$20.05	\$21.99	\$20.60	\$22.50
Totals	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100

'N' of completed budgets with completed demographics: 35 (age 61+), 123 (under 62)

Note: Some calculations don't add exactly to \$100, due to math errors or rounding

Comments Section

Narratives are the most direct form of feedback, but are still subject to interpretation of individuals' writing. Many people record their comments in a hurried and unedited way.

CITIZEN COMMENTS ABOUT SERVICES IN THEIR NEIGHBORHOODS: FREQUENCY OF ITEMS OF CONCERN OF ADULTS AND YOUTH

<i>Frequently Mentioned Service Items of the Major Departments, by Type</i>	<i>Adult Totals (% of all)</i>	<i>Youth Totals (% of all)</i>
<i>Responsiveness Issues:</i>		
(POLICE) Police deployment/community policing	27 (5.3%)	26 (6.5%)
(POLICE) Police response time	22 (4.3%)	10 (2.5%)
(ALL) City employee performance and management	15 (3%)	1 (.3%)
(ALL) more partnerships with the community	13 (2.6%)	13 (3.2%)
(ALL) Handling of community calls and service complaints	10 (2%)	--
(ALL) Focus on fundamental field-based services	9 (1.8%)	--
(POLICE) Police officer propriety	5 (1%)	3 (.8%)
<i>Maintenance Tasks:</i>		
(PLD) street lighting in neighborhoods, including alleys	35 (6.9%)	28 (7%)
(DPW) street maintenance	19 (3.7%)	29 (7.2%)
(BSE) pace of demolition of abandoned buildings	12 (2.4%)	38 (9.5%)
(REC) recreation facilities maintenance and park mowing	12 (2.4%)	34 (8.5%)
(REC) tree trimming or removal	12 (2.4%)	1 (.3%)
(DPW) sidewalk repair	6 (1.2%)	3 (.8%)
<i>Enforcement Tasks:</i>		
(POLICE) tight enforcement of all other laws	12 (2.4%)	5 (1.3%)
(POLICE) traffic enforcement	11 (2.2%)	3 (.8%)
(POLICE) drug enforcement	10 (2%)	20 (5%)
(BSE) property maintenance code enforcement	10 (2%)	5 (1.3%)
(HEALTH) animal control	6 (1.2%)	5 (1.3%)
<i>Cleanup Tasks:</i>		
(DPW) solid waste code enforcement	30 (5.9%)	5 (1.3%)
(DPW) vacant lot and other cleanup	25 (4.9%)	36 (9%)
(POLICE) abandoned cars	15 (3%)	5 (1.3%)
(DPW) more frequent/more thorough bulk pickup	11 (2.2%)	3 (.8%)
(DPW) cleaning streets	10 (2%)	19 (4.7%)
<i>Other Service Provision:</i>		
(REC) additional recreation programs, including after school	9 (1.8%)	16 (4%)
(PDD) preserve / renovate abandoned buildings	9 (1.8%)	8 (2%)
(ZOO) open Belle Isle Zoo	6 (1.2%)	--
(PDD) redevelop vacant lots	--	21 (5.2%)
(PDD) small business / job development	--	10 (2.5%)
Total Major Department Comments	361 (70.7%)	347 (86.3%)
Total of All Service Items on Survey	511 (100%)	402 (100%)

MISCELLANEOUS OTHER SERVICE COMMENTS (Adults, 26 items; Youth, 25 items)

TOTAL ADULT COMMENTS: 213 of 393 surveys had comments, with 52 items and 511 mentions (totals exclude public comment periods at the end of each public meeting)

TOTAL YOUTH COMMENTS: 164 of 303 surveys had comments, with 42 items and 402 mentions